

RALPH N. KLEPS AWARDS  
For Improvement in the Administration of the Courts  
Nominations 2003

---

**ELIGIBILITY**

---

- A. To be eligible for an award, a project must meet all of the following criteria:
- ◆ It is a project of a California court.
  - ◆ It reflects the intent of at least one of the six goals of the Judicial Council's strategic plan.
  - ◆ It is innovative. "Innovative" is defined as *creating value by initiating practices that enhance judicial efficiency and effectiveness*.
  - ◆ It has results, outcomes, or benefits that demonstrate its impact on the court and the public it serves.
  - ◆ It is replicable in other courts.
- B. Each court fits into one of five award categories, depending on the number of authorized judicial positions (AJP) it has:
- |                                   |                                 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Superior courts with 2–6 AJP   | 4. Superior courts with 50+ AJP |
| 2. Superior courts with 7–19 AJP  | 5. Appellate courts             |
| 3. Superior courts with 20–49 AJP |                                 |
- The total number of awards given, encompassing all categories, may go up to 11.
- C. Each superior or appellate court may submit up to *two* nominations (the Superior Court of Los Angeles County may nominate up to four projects). Projects that do not receive an award the first time may be renominated once.

---

**NOMINATION PROCEDURES**

---

- A. All questions on the nomination form must be answered.
- B. Please designate a single contact person from the court who will be responsible for securing additional information and coordinating the site visit.
- C. Members of the Kleps Awards Committee will review nominations and visit the sites of nominated projects that fully meet the eligibility criteria. The Judicial Council will make the final determination of award recipients at its December 2003 meeting.
- D. Nominations must be e-mailed to [beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov) (Administrative Office of the Courts) no later than **5 p.m. on Tuesday, July 1, 2003**. Faxed, mailed, or incomplete nomination forms will not be considered. The nomination form can be obtained from [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/jc/kleps.htm](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/jc/kleps.htm). If the project includes a product (videotape, manual, etc.), do not submit it with the nomination form. All collateral material will be requested after the eligibility screening.

*Direct any questions to Beth Shirk at 415-865-7870 or [beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov).*

# Judicial Council of California

## Strategic Plan Goals

*Goal I: ACCESS, FAIRNESS, AND DIVERSITY.* All Californians will have equal access to the courts and equal ability to participate in court proceedings, and will be treated in a fair and just manner. Members of the judicial branch community will reflect the rich diversity of the state's residents.

*Goal II: INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.* The judiciary will be an institutionally independent, separate branch of government that responsibly seeks, uses, and accounts for public resources necessary for its support. The independence of judicial decision-making will be protected.

*Goal III: MODERNIZATION OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.* Justice will be administered in a timely, efficient, and effective manner that utilizes contemporary management practices; innovative ideas; highly competent judges, other judicial officers, and staff; and adequate facilities.

*Goal IV: QUALITY OF JUSTICE AND SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC.* Judicial branch services will be responsive to the needs of the public and will enhance the public's understanding and use of and its confidence in the judiciary.

*Goal V: EDUCATION.* The effectiveness of judges, court personnel, and other judicial branch staff will be enhanced through high-quality continuing education and professional development.

*Goal VI: TECHNOLOGY.* Technology will enhance the quality of justice by improving the ability of the judicial branch to collect, process, analyze, and share information and by increasing the public's access to information about the judicial branch.

Please refer to [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/stplan2k.pdf](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/stplan2k.pdf).

## Categories for Kleps Awards

Category 1 (2–6 AJP)		Category 2 (7–19 AJP)		Category 3 (20–49 AJP)		Category 4 (50+ AJP)	Category 5 (Appellate Courts)
Alpine	Mono	Butte	Placer	Contra Costa	Tulare	Alameda	All appellate courts Supreme Court
Amador	Plumas	El Dorado	San Luis	Fresno	Ventura	Los Angeles	
Calaveras	San Benito	Humboldt	Obispo	Kern		Orange	
Colusa	Sierra	Imperial	Santa Cruz	Monterey		Riverside	
Del Norte	Siskiyou	Kings	Shasta	San Joaquin		Sacramento	
Glenn	Sutter	Madera	Yolo	San Mateo		San Bernardino	
Inyo	Tehama	Marin		Santa Barbara		San Diego	
Lake	Trinity	Mendocino		Solano		San Francisco	
Lassen	Tuolumne	Merced		Sonoma		Santa Clara	
Mariposa	Yuba	Napa		Stanislaus			
Modoc		Nevada					

RALPH N. KLEPS AWARDS  
For Improvement in the Administration of the Courts  
2003 Nomination Form

Due by 5 p.m., Tuesday, July 1, 2003

*E-mail this form to beth.shirk@jud.ca.gov. For questions, call Beth Shirk at 415-865-7870.*

**Court:**

**Nomination Category  
(1, 2, 3, 4, or 5):**

**Title of Project:**

**Project Location/Address:**

**Project Contact (name and title):**

**Contact Phone Number (with area code):**

**Contact E-mail Address:**

**Project Summary (maximum of 150 words):**

**Has this project been nominated for a Kleps award before? \_\_\_\_\_ If so, when? \_\_\_\_\_**

1. What problem or need was this project initiated to address (maximum of 150 words)?
2. What are the project's goals or desired outcomes (maximum of 150 words)?
3. Briefly describe how the project works, including staffing, activities, sources and amounts of funding, and any collaborative partners. Please include an estimate of how many people have been served or have benefited (maximum of 400 words).
4. What are the impacts on your court and the public? How are you measuring and documenting the results, outcomes, or benefits of the project (maximum of 150 words)?
5. Are similar projects operating in other courts? Is this project based on a model from another court (maximum of 150 words)?
6. How does the project reflect the intent of one or more goals of the strategic plan of the Judicial Council of California (maximum of 150 words)?
7. How does the project enhance judicial efficiency and effectiveness (maximum of 150 words)?
8. How is the project replicable, and what strategies would you recommend for disseminating this project to other courts (maximum of 150 words)?